



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the second, *Acheminement vers le Pouvoir*, closes with the year 55, in which by the murder of Britannicus and the repression of Agrippina Nero sought to secure his imperial position; the third, *Le Ministère de Sénèque*, discusses in much detail the character of the government as directed by Seneca, down to 59 A.D., which year probably marks the high tide of the minister's influence and prosperity; the fourth, *La Retraite de Sénèque*, carries us through Seneca's dismissal to his death in 65.

The work is clearly written in a graceful style. The author shows himself well acquainted with his sources, accurate, and careful; but, as he says in his introduction, he has given little attention to criticism of his authorities, accepting their statements freely, endeavoring to reconcile their contradictions when possible, when not, to present their divergent views impartially, unless confident that one account is to be preferred. M. Waltz's final estimate of Seneca is decidedly more favorable than that generally given; indeed at times he is almost panegyrical. But Seneca's obvious weaknesses will probably continue to determine men's judgment against him. Nevertheless, M. Waltz is largely right in regarding him as the natural successor of Augustus in his endeavors to secure personal liberty, supremacy of law, and the independence of the senate. The example of Augustus, however, was far from being the only or even the main spring of Seneca's efforts; and certainly the kindly rule of the Antonines was not chiefly determined by Seneca's ministry, as M. Waltz implies, but by a multitude of influences, of which Seneca was only one.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Development of Hungarian Constitutional Liberty. By Count JULIUS ANDRÁSSY. Translated from the Hungarian by C. ARTHUR and ILONA GINEVER. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Company, Ltd. 1908. Pp. v, 465.)

ONE cannot help wondering just what public Count Julius Andrássy had in mind when he wrote the above work and still more for whom the translation was designed. Presumably not the general reader, as it takes for granted a very considerable preliminary knowledge of both English and Hungarian constitutional history—an accomplishment which is rather uncommon at least among English-speaking peoples. Without this knowledge it is hard to follow the author, for what he has given us is not a continuous narrative, but a succession of assertions based on facts which he mentions without describing, presupposing our familiarity with men and events. As the style is prolix not to say turgid, the book is wearisome reading; indeed it is one of those where he who forgets to put in his book-mark when he stops is likely to be sorry when he takes the volume up again. On the other hand, it is hardly meant for

the specialist, as the treatment of the subject cannot be called scholarly. The work abounds in loose assumptions and in conclusions based on facts, many of which are either of doubtful exactness or capable of being interpreted in another way. The whole tone is not scientific but popular-patriotic. No people, indeed, are more intensely patriotic than the Hungarians and they seem to find it harder even than the rest of us to discuss without strong bias anything relating to their country. For this we have to make allowances, but even patriotism does not excuse a writer for inflicting on us rhetorical commonplaces of a general nature such as: "A tyrant sees a culprit even in an innocent man and does all in his power to remove from his path anyone who is likely to be dangerous, but he who builds a golden bridge over which the unfaithful may return to him, is evidently guided by other motives than a desire for absolute power. . . . One of the greatest disadvantages of a monarchical or aristocratic régime is that political power is sometimes conferred by inheritance upon unsuitable men. . . . A great man is a rare gift of Providence. Mortals simply do not know what influences create and mould him." And there are dozens of other examples of this sort.

It has often been pointed out, especially by Hungarians, that there is a certain analogy between English and Hungarian constitutional history. A comparative study of the two in English is well worth while, and Count Andrassy's book, the larger part of which is taken up with this comparison, is, if not convincing, at least thoughtful and full of suggestions. Many of his statements are open to challenge but it would take a volume bulkier than his own to discuss them in detail. As might be expected he finds similarities and overlooks differences wherever it is possible. We can see that he strives to be fair as well as philosophic but his love of generalizing is a constant source of irritation to the reader. One country he refers to less than he well might, the one whose constitutional growth was up to a certain point most like that of Hungary, namely Poland. The later history of the two has indeed been different, but especially during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries their development was much the same. In truth if we take them for comparison early in the sixteenth century when they were under the rule of the brothers Wladislaw and Sigismund of the Jagello family we are struck by the similarity of their institutions and of their general conditions. In both by this time the power of the contending factions, that is to say the magnates and the gentry, overshadowed that of the crown and was tending towards aristocratic anarchy. There was little to choose between the two countries in the outlook for the future of their constitutional development. But the destinies of Hungary were violently changed by the battle of Mohács, the conquest of one part of the land by the Turks, and the establishment of the tenacious sovereignty of the Hapsburgs over the rest. Thenceforward no analogies with England, Poland or any other country are particularly fruitful.

After battling bravely for their liberties and losing them more than once the Hungarians have now regained them again, so much so that they are in a position to limit those of others. It is characteristic of the Magyar way of ignoring such questions that Count Andrassy makes only the scantiest possible reference to the other nationalities in Hungary, their history, their complaints, and their aspirations, although this subject is by far the most important one in Hungarian politics at the present day. It is true that his book deals with Hungarian liberty not Croatian or Roumanian or Slovak, and that historically these can be left to the second volume which we are told he intends to write.

In conclusion we wish to protest against the attempt to force Magyar names on the foreign reader in place of those which have been generally accepted by the outside world. It is all very well in the Hungarian original to talk of the "Archbishop of Esztergom" and the defenders of "Köszeg" but an English translation if it wishes people to know what it is talking about should at least add "Gran" and "Güns" in parentheses.

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

La Société Française au Temps de Philippe-Auguste. Par ACHILLE LUCHAIRE, Membre de l'Institut. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1909. Pp. iii, 459.)

FROM 1895 to 1900 M. Luchaire gave courses at the Sorbonne on the period of Philip Augustus preparatory to writing a complete history of the reign of that monarch and then, when the results of these studies might have been expected to appear in print, suddenly abandoned his design and devoted his efforts to the well-known series on Innocent III. The reason for this deviation was without doubt the appearance of the first fascicules of Cartellieri's *Philipp II. August, König von Frankreich*; it was a question whether Cartellieri's work would not make another superfluous. Time showed that social history remained outside of the domain of Cartellieri and this gap Luchaire undertook to fill. He had printed several articles of this nature and had prepared the manuscript of others when he was overtaken by death. These printed and unprinted materials have been arranged, given the final touch, and published by Louis Halphen, one of Luchaire's former students, in the volume under review.

The subject-matter of the book is best seen from the chapter-headings: I. *État Matériel et Moral de la Population*; II. *Paroisses et Curés*; III. *L'Étudiant*; IV. *Le Chanoine*; V. *L'Évêque*; VI. *L'Esprit Monastique*; VII. *La Vie Monastique*; VIII. *La Féodalité Pillarde et Sanguinaire*; IX. *Le Noble en Temps de Paix*; X. *Les Budgets Seigneuriaux*; *Le Chevalerie*; XI. *La Chatelaine*; XII. *La Courtoisie et la Noblesse Courtoise*; XIII. *Les Paysans et les Bourgeois*. The volume sticks scrupulously to the field designated by its title: "France under Philip Augustus". If now and then it reaches beyond the limits of the reign of Philip or the